UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,624	04/09/2004	Michael John Dunkley	0197.00	8935
21968 NEKTAR THE	7590 03/18/200 RAPEUTICS)8	EXAMINER	
201 INDUSTRI	IAL ROAD		ALI, SHUMAYA B	
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3771	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/821,624	DUNKLEY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	SHUMAYA B. ALI	3771					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>16 January 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS <i>A</i>	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth a later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO				
xtensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, nay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extern Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, let (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); ter form for appeal by materially rec	TE below);					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected 20 27 28 24 and 22		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>20,27,28,31 and 32</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>21-26</u> .							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Justine R Yu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3771	/Shumaya B. Ali / Examiner, Art Unit 3771						

Continuation of 13. Other: In the remark filed on 1/16/08, Applicant primarily argues, "The contact surface [L] of Valentini et al is the angled surface on which the capsule rests during puncturing of the capsule. There are not protrusions extending form that surface) (see page 2 lines 14-16). This argument however is not well taken because the angled portions are the protrusions on the contact surface. Furthermore, without the angled portion, the contact surface (L) would be completely flat, thus, the angled portions create two separate projections on a flat contact surface (L). Thus, Valentini discloses "one or more protrusions" as claimed. On page 2 lines 16-19 Applicant argues that the forward end of the contact surface does not contact the capsule. This argument is not well taken because claimed recites "surface adapted to contact the capsule" and "protrusions for contacting the capsule", thus, the claimed limitation which Applicant argues for are recitation of intended use. Depending on how the user holds the inhaler, the contact surface can be adapted to contact the capsule. For example, the capsule can be slid in and out of a passage way (passage way extending from N to where capsule is positioned in figure 2), therefore, when a user holds the inhaler in a position shown in figure 1 the capsule would slide toward the contact surface. Thus, Valentini further teaches the contact surface is adapted to contact the capsule. On page 2 lines 16 and 17 Applicant argues, that "To say the forward end of the angled surface is a "protrusion" is no different than saying a flat tabletop comprises protrusions because of its four edges", this argument is confusing because Valentini's reference does not provide support for edges of the alignment guide (L) creating a flat surface. Valentini continues to read on claimed invention, thus, rejection set forth in the previous office action is maintained.